



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,724	09/30/2003	Vibhu Mittal	16113-1300001	2943
26192 7590 03/25/2009 FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				
EXAMINER				
CHEN, TE Y				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2161				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/25/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/676,724

Applicant(s)

MITTAL ET AL.

Examiner

SUSAN Y. CHEN

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 January 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Amendment

This office action is in response to the amendment filed on Jan. 07, 2009.

Claims 14-21 are pending for examination; claims 1-15 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 14-21, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,724,593 issued to Hargrave et al. (hereinafter referred as Hargrave).

Claim 14:

Hargrave discloses a search method comprising:

obtaining a query including one or more terms, each term written in a first format from a user [e.g., col. 5, lines 10 – 22, the source to target language formatting in Fig. 6, col. 9, lines 66—67, col. 13, lines 24 – 30, the step 903, Fig. 9];

translating the one or more terms of the query into a group of translated queries, each translated query having one or more terms in a second format using a

probabilistic dictionary, the probabilistic dictionary mapping terms from the first format to the second format [e.g., the use of bilingual dictionaries at col. 1, lines 18 – 22, the use of computer software to perform probabilistic dictionary language translation at col. 5, lines 22 – col. 8, line 60, the software of Translation Memory (TM) system of Fig. 1 encodes, converts and decodes the query language in query format into a computer readable format, the steps: 905-907 of Fig. 9 and associated texts];

searching a database for information responsive to one or more translated queries of the group of translated queries [e.g., col. 2, lines 38-44, col. 4, lines 22-26 & col. 5, lines 10 – 22, the detect matching of the fuzzy retriever in Fig. 9, col. 14, lines 6 - 8]; and

returning search results written in the second format to the user, the search results referencing one or more documents responsive to the one or more translated queries [e.g., the use of correlation and linking back techniques at col. 12, lines 50 - 55, Fig. 9 and associated texts].

Claim 15:

Except the limitations recited in claim 14, Hargrave further discloses:

obtaining search result selections from the user [e.g., the steps: 903-907, Fig. 9];

using said search result selections to modify the probabilistic dictionary of term mappings [e.g., col. 13, lines 20 – 57, the steps: 903-913, Fig. 9].

Claim 16:

Except the limitations recited in claim 15, Hargrave further discloses the modification comprises adjusting at least one probability associated with at least one mapping in the probabilistic dictionary [e.g., col. 5, lines 1-9, Fig. 9 and associated texts].

Claim 17:

Except the limitations recited in claim 14, Hargrave further discloses the step of translating the query into the second format includes expanding the query [e.g., col. 13, lines 41-57].

Claim 18:

Except the limitations recited in claim 17, Hargrave further discloses the expanded query includes alternative encodings of the query terms [e.g., col. 14, lines 1-16].

Claim 19:

Except the limitations recited in claim 17, Hargrave further discloses the expanded query includes alternative language translations of the query terms [e.g., col. 14, lines 16-17].

Claim 20:

Except the limitations recited in claim 17, Hargrave further discloses the expanded query includes alternative encodings and alternative language translations of the query terms [e.g., [e.g., col. 14, lines 1-17].

Claim 21:

Except the limitations recited in claim 18, Hargrave further disclose the expanded query includes synonyms of the alternative encodings of the query terms [e.g., col. 2, lines 38-63].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on Jan. 07, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The examiner disagrees with applicant's arguments and piece-meal interpretations that "Hargrave does not disclose or suggest the claimed searching a database for information responsive to one or more translated queries of the groups of translated queries."

In reply to the above arguments the examiner first points out that the instant method claims do not including any physical device/machine to perform the claimed steps, it seems that the whole set of claims merely direct to an "abstract process of thinking" which is deemed to be non-statutory.

Furthermore, applicant fails to recite any specific query translation algorithm/technique, as such, it is open for reasonable art interpretation.

Moreover, the examiner directs applicant attention to Fig. 9 of Hargrave, wherein, Hargrave clearly disclosed the steps such as 905 and 907 to translate user input queries by tokenizing, weighting, filtering, normalizing process to derive a query vector with a listing of normalized weights for each unique latter n-gram which associated with a specific query in a group of user queries for supporting rapid fuzzy retrieval from a statistic weighted Translation Memory (or TM) based on users queries [e.g., col. 13, lines 32 – col. 14, lines 40]. Thus, in contrary to applicant's arguments, Hargrave clearly disclosed the claimed features.

As set forth above, because applicant does not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or rejections, therefore, it is believed that the rejections on record should be sustained.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Points of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SUSAN Y. CHEN whose telephone number is (571)272-4016. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mofiz Apu can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Susan Y Chen/
Partial Sig. Examiner
Art Unit 2161

March 19, 2009

/Apu M Mofiz/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161